

MHSOAC
RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002
Questions and Answers 1

RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002			
Questions and Answers 1			
	RFP Section Reference	Question	MHSOAC Response
1	Page 5/6	<p>Trans Family Support Services (“TFSS”) appreciates that the Commission recognizes the diverseness of the LGBTQ community as exhibited in the statement on Page 5:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Although all of the different identities within LGBTQ are often listed together, there are specific needs and concerns related to each individual identity. For the purposes of this RFP, this acronym is used throughout but with the recognition that there are myriad of identities, attractions and expressions by individuals from all races, ethnicities, cultures, genders, ages, and backgrounds that cannot begin to be covered by a simple acronym.”</p> <p>While TFSS (transfamilyosos.org) is not qualified to submit a proposal as a lead or prime contractor, this organization is well suited to provide subcontractor services for the Transgender and Queer communities. As the RFP states, “... collaborative Proposals including subcontractors are acceptable and even encouraged to provide the relevant range of expertise and/or capacity...(Page 6)”</p> <p>How does a qualified and interested sub-contractor (transfamilyosos.org), with specific transgender and queer community expertise in 1) family engagement</p>	<p>The MHSOAC cannot make any suggestions or recommendations since we are in an active procurement.</p> <p>It is public information that the current contractor is Health Access Foundation.</p> <p>All of the questions submitted to the MHSOAC will be published and seen by the organizations interested in submitting proposals.</p>

MHSOAC
RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002
Questions and Answers 1

RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002			
Questions and Answers 1			
	RFP Section Reference	Question	MHSOAC Response
		(more than 600 families), 2) support (youth, adult, family, mentoring), training (physical and behavioral healthcare, schools and government), and advocacy (local, state and national) connect with the bidders for lead/prime contractors?	
2	P. 13 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS #4	<p>RFP states: Have more than 50% of the staff or board members who are LGBTQ.</p> <p><i>Question:</i> At the November MHSOAC meeting, this was also present on the RFP outline. When questioned about this minimum requirement, MHSOAC staff explained that for the LGBTQ RFP “staff” constituted “Program Staff” and not necessarily the staff of the entire agency. Is that correct?</p> <p>Should the RFP be corrected to state “program staff”?</p>	<p>See Addendum 1</p> <p>Staff, may include program staff.</p>
3	P. 13 PROPOSER BACKGROUND #9	<p>RFP asks to “Provide support” regarding how many staff/employees are LGBTQ.</p> <p><i>Question:</i> LGBTQ identity is personal. The response to this RFP is available to the public upon request. Asking to provide support beyond a statement of numbers, is not only culturally inappropriate, but could place some staff or board members in danger should their name, position, or any other identifier that is not completely anonymous be required. While we are strong advocates for SOGI data collection, we always encourage anonymity and aggregation of such data for</p>	<p>Any Personal Identifiable information provided in a proposal will be redacted prior to being available to the public.</p> <p>There will be no change to the RFP.</p>

MHSOAC
RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002
Questions and Answers 1

RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002			
Questions and Answers 1			
	RFP Section Reference	Question	MHSOAC Response
		individual privacy and safety. Could you please edit the RFP to reflect this need?	
4	P. 21 SUBCONTRACTOR REPLACEMENT	RFP states throughout the paragraph that the Contractor must obtain approval from, and possibly present the reasons for change to the Commission. It also states that “no change will occur unless the Commission agrees to the change.” <i>Question:</i> Should this paragraph state, instead, that the Contract Manager and/or other MHSOAC staff be responsible for this?	The RFP language is correct. No change will be made.
5	P. 31 Evaluation Scoring Detail— III.C.BACKGROUND— C.3.a Provide Support	RFP asks: What counties do you have a branch/physical presence located? <i>Questions:</i> Can physical presence include Regions/Counties where we have current contractors? Can physical presence include Regions/Counties where we have current members of our Program/Organization?	The requirement is for the Proposer’s background and does not include contractors. The requirement is for the Organization’s physical presence and not a member’s physical location.
6	Evaluation Panel, Page 29	Will the Evaluation Panel include representatives from LGBTQ populations, particularly those with LGBTQ mental health expertise?	This question is outside the scope of the RFP requirements and will not be answered.
7	Proposer Capacity, page 14	What constitutes sufficient local capacity for the state-wide lead to “perform all the duties independently” for local level events and local level advocacy?	Based on the plan proposed, the Proposer needs to determine sufficient capacity that they can

MHSOAC
RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002
Questions and Answers 1

RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002			
Questions and Answers 1			
	RFP Section Reference	Question	MHSOAC Response
	“proposers may perform all the duties independently.”	Is having existing volunteers in the area sufficient? Is having local staff in the area sufficient? Is having a local office in the area sufficient?	successfully perform all the duties required in the RFP.
8	Local event and engagement requirements, Cost Worksheet Page 70-71	In order for the state lead to retain funds for “Event #: Additional Local Community Engagement,” instead of “passing through” the funds to an LLE, do we need to have a local office in that location? If so, what do you consider a local office?	There is no requirement for a local office.
9	Page 70 Cost Worksheet	The RFP states we should not modify Attachment 10 but there does appear to be space for the event names on lines 1-15. Are the proposers expected to put event names from the workplan on those lines?	Proposers do not need to include the event name on Attachment 10
10	Page 70 Cost Worksheet	If the funds listed on lines 16-30 are passed through directly to each Local Level Entity (LLEs) should the proposer list the LLE name and/or region of the event and advocacy on these lines?	Proposers do not need to include the LLEs name on Attachment 10
11	Page 85 Sample Contract, budget detail and payment provisions, ExB 1Ai	Where in the workplan and/cost worksheet are the state leads being compensated for the administrative cost of overseeing the LLE subcontract activities, LLE reporting, and fiscal oversight? Can the proposer retain 15% of the “pass through” funds (Page 70-71 Cost Worksheet Lines 16-30) for administration of the LLE subcontracts?	Section IV.D. states, “The Contractor agrees to the budgeted funding listed on the Cost Worksheet (ATTACHMENT 10), including the amounts listed on lines 16 – 30, to be paid directly to the LLE, if applicable.” Furthermore, Attachment 17, Exhibit B, 1. Payment Milestones, explains the funding available in the contract, including costs for Administration and the LLE. Up to 15% of the contract is identified as Contractor Administration, less the amounts paid

MHSOAC
RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002
Questions and Answers 1

RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002			
Questions and Answers 1			
	RFP Section Reference	Question	MHSOAC Response
		(The 15% admin in other categories is needed to support those activities and should not be used to oversee the LLEs)	<p>directly to an LLE. These funds are intended to cover any and all administration of the contract in complying with the Scope of Work.</p> <p>The requirement will not be changed.</p>
12	Quantity of LLEs	Can proposers have two LLE's in an area in one year working together (example: Year 1 Specific County – LLE A and LLE B split the funds) or does it need to be only one LLE per region per year?	Proposers may have more than one LLE in an area. Each LLE must meet the requirements in the RFP. Funds identified for the LLE may be split between the multiple LLEs. Scoring will be based on the number of Local Community Engagements with an LLE and not the number of LLEs in the proposal.
13	Page 15 – Local Community Engagement Events	The Description states that “No less that two (2) events shall occur in each of the five (5) regions of the State ... without duplicating the event location in any of the regions.” How is the Commission defining “event location”? Is this same county, city, service area, service sub-population, building, etc.? This is of particular concern in the Los Angeles Region, which consists of one county. We want to ensure that we have the flexibility to hold events where the community identifies the greatest needs.	Depending upon the Proposer's proposed event, in which a location will be identified, this could be a specific venue, neighborhood, city, county, or region.
14	Page 23 – Local Community Engagement Tasks and Activities	2.3.e.2.d. States “Documentation [of relationship] must be signed by both parties and cannot be signed by a fiscal agent of the Local Level Entity.” It is common practice for small community-based LGBTQ organizations to use a fiscal agent, and also for MOU's	The use of a Local Level Entity is optional. Proposers may use other individuals, groups, or organizations through an informal agreement (III.D.)

MHSOAC
RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002
Questions and Answers 1

RFP STAKEHOLDER LGBTQ 002			
Questions and Answers 1			
	RFP Section Reference	Question	MHSOAC Response
		to be signed by the fiscal agent – potentially in addition to the local entity – because this is who payment is made out to, etc. Is it possible to include fiscal agents in addition to leadership of the local entity?	If a Local Level Entity signs the MOU or contract, there is no need for another signature. A fiscal agent may sign with the Local Level Entity. The Local Level Entity must meet the definition of an LLE as stated in III.D. Proposer Qualification and provide the information required in V.A.2.e.2.
15	Page 35 – A.2.e.2 (900 points) Page 55 - V.A.2.e.2 Page 70-71 Cost Proposal	How will it impact scoring if the proposer takes lead on both state and local efforts? Example: Instead of identifying LLE contractors for the full amounts on Cost Proposal Lines 16-30, the proposer identifies it's statewide office as the lead for local level engagement activities (retaining the funds on Lines 16-30) and contracts to local entities or volunteers for less than the \$30,000 and \$13,000 per year.	The RFP scoring is defined in detail at IX.A. Proposal Scoring, including points available for LLEs.
16	Page 35 A3b	The math appears to be for the state events (x3) not the local events (x15). Can the scoring be modified to reflect <i>(15 events x 5 points each x 2)</i> ?	See Addendum 1 Scoring explanation will be changed to reflect 15 events x 5 points each x 2.
17	Page 66, Att 9 A9b	The Evaluation Scoring Detail, for State Event Activities, includes A9b 'Expected Outcomes' on page 38 but there is not a designated space for this on Attachment 9. Can Att 9 be modified to include A9b?	See Addendum 1 This line item will be removed from the scoring detail.
18	Page 27, C. Number of Copies	Does the MASTER proposal require wet signatures for all 15 LLE MOU attachments or just Attachments 1-16?	The "Master" proposal shall have wet signatures for all documents included in the proposal.
19	Attachment 13 Bidder Declaration	The link does not appear to be working	See Addendum 1 for updated link